

**WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
Professional Corporation**

CONOR TUCKER, State Bar No. 318075

ctucker@wsgr.com

1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 2800

Los Angeles, California 91356

Telephone: (424) 446-6900

Facsimile: (866) 974-7329

Attorney for Defendant YouTube LLC

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

TODD MICHAEL SCHULTZ

Plaintiff,

v.

MICHAEL C. THOMPSON et al.

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:23-cv-03452-JAK  
(MRWx)

**DEFENDANT YOUTUBE LLC'S  
OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFF  
TODD MICHAEL SCHULTZ'  
REQUEST FOR ADMISSION,  
SET ONE**

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 33 and the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, Defendant YouTube LLC (“YouTube”) hereby responds to Plaintiff Todd Michael Schultz’s Request for Admissions (“RFAs”) as follows:

### **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provide that Plaintiff “may not seek discovery from any source” until after the Rule 26(f) Conference has taken place. *See* Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). The Court has already ordered that deadlines for discovery—including the Rule 26(f) Conference—will not be set until “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” Order Denying Motion for Leave to File Discovery Motion (ECF 44) at 2. These RFAs are thus entirely premature.

The Court’s Order was well taken. “[S]ection 230 must be interpreted to protect websites not merely from ultimate liability, but from having to fight costly and protracted legal battles.” *Fair Hous. Council v. Roommates.com LLC*, 521 F.3d 1157, 1175 (9th Cir. 2008) (en banc). For that reason, and as many courts have determined, discovery is inappropriate—as here—before Section 230 immunity has been resolved. *See, e.g., Doe v. Reddit, Inc.* No. SACV21-768 JVS (KESx), 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 129876 at \*19-20 (C.D. Cal. July 12, 2021) (granting motion to stay discovery pending resolution of motion to dismiss based on CDA immunity); *Onuaha v. Facebook, Inc.*, No. 5:16-cv-06440-EJD, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 53963, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 7, 2017) (same); *Universal Commc’n Sys. v. Lycos, Inc.*, 478 F.3d 413, 425—426 (1st Cir. 2007) (holding district court appropriately denied preliminary discovery in CDA action).

Despite being informed that discovery was not yet open and the RFAs were premature, Plaintiff repeatedly refused to withdraw them. YouTube objects to any response and reserves its right to timely respond and/or supplement these objections—including adding further objections if warranted—until “after any

1 Motions to Dismiss are resolved,” the Parties’ Rule 26(f) conference has been  
2 conducted, and further objection or response is deemed appropriate or ordered by  
3 the Court.

4 No incidental or implied admissions are intended herein. The fact that  
5 YouTube has objected to any RFA should not be taken as an admission or that  
6 YouTube accepts the existence of any “facts” or information set forth or assumed  
7 by the RFAs.

## 8 **OBJECTIONS**

### 9 **Request for Admission No. 1**

10 Admit that you are familiar with the HL Channel and that it belongs  
11 to Thompson.

### 12 **Objections to Request for Admission No. 1:**

13 YouTube objects to RFA No. 1 as premature, as the parties have not  
14 conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.”  
15 Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in  
16 violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until  
17 “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further  
18 objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California  
19 civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent  
20 with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater  
21 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
22 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
23 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
24 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
25 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
26 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
27  
28

1 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
 2 a legal conclusion. YouTube further objects to this request as compound.

3 **Request for Admission No. 2**

4 Admit that you understand that HL Channel uses, and has used since  
 5 February 2021, copyrighted material belonging to Plaintiff.

6 **Objections to Request for Admission No. 2:**

7 YouTube objects to RFA No. 2 as premature, as the parties have not  
 8 conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.”  
 9 Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in  
 10 violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until  
 11 “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further  
 12 objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California  
 13 civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent  
 14 with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater  
 15 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
 16 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
 17 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
 18 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
 19 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
 20 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
 21 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
 22 a legal conclusion. YouTube further objects to this request as compound.  
 23 YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for information beyond  
 24 YouTube’s knowledge, custody, or control.

25 **Request for Admission No. 3**

26 Admit that you understand HL Channel is meant to deride or otherwise  
 27 harm the reputation of Plaintiff.

28

**Objections to Request for Admission No. 3:**

YouTube objects to RFA No. 3 as premature, as the parties have not conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.” Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for information beyond YouTube’s knowledge, custody, or control.

**Request for Admission No. 4**

Admit that you understand HL Channel is meant to harass and induce emotional distress in Plaintiff.

**Objections to Request for Admission No. 4:**

YouTube objects to RFA No. 4 as premature, as the parties have not conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.” Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further

1 objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California  
2 civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent  
3 with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater  
4 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
5 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
6 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
7 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
8 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
9 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
10 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
11 a legal conclusion. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
12 information beyond YouTube's knowledge, custody, or control.

13 **Request for Admission No. 5**

14 Admit that you are negligent in upholding your Terms of Service, as  
15 it relates to protecting the civil rights and user rights of Plaintiff.

16 **Objections to Request for Admission No. 5:**

17 YouTube objects to RFA No. 5 as premature, as the parties have not  
18 conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff "may not seek  
19 discovery." Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this  
20 request as served in violation of the Court's Order, under which Discovery  
21 cannot commence until "after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved." ECF  
22 44 at 2. YouTube further objects to this request as propounded pursuant to  
23 an inapplicable rule of California civil procedure. YouTube objects to this  
24 request to the extent it is inconsistent with, or does not meet the  
25 requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater than those imposed  
26 by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further objects to this  
27 request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney work  
28

1 product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
2 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it  
3 calls for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such  
4 like information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter  
5 governing such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the  
6 extent it calls for a legal conclusion.

7 **Request for Admission No. 6**

8 Admit that you are aware of Thompson's "Parking Lot Creeper"  
9 Channel and the nature of its content.

10 **Objections to Request for Admission No. 6:**

11 YouTube objects to RFA No. 6 as premature, as the parties have not  
12 conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.”  
13 Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in  
14 violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until  
15 “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further  
16 objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California  
17 civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent  
18 with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater  
19 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
20 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
21 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
22 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
23 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
24 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
25 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
26 a legal conclusion. YouTube further objects to this request because “Parking Lot  
27 Creeper” is not adequately defined or identified. YouTube further objects to this  
28



1 request because “aware” is vague and ambiguous. YouTube further objects to this  
2 request to the extent it calls for information beyond YouTube’s knowledge,  
3 custody, or control.

4 **Request for Admission No. 7**

5 Admit that malicious harassment designed to inflict emotional distress  
6 on a person is against your Terms of Service.

7 **Objections to Request for Admission No. 7:**

8 YouTube objects to RFA No. 7 as premature, as the parties have not  
9 conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.”  
10 Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in  
11 violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until  
12 “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further  
13 objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California  
14 civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent  
15 with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater  
16 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
17 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
18 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
19 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
20 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
21 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
22 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
23 a legal conclusion. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
24 information beyond YouTube’s knowledge, custody, or control.

25 **Request for Admission No. 8**

26 Admit or deny that human moderators reviewed and responded to  
27 "Channel Reports" in 2021 regarding HL Channel.  
28



**Objections to Request for Admission No. 8:**

YouTube objects to RFA No. 8 as premature, as the parties have not conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.” Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion. YouTube further objects to this request because “Channel Reports” is not adequately defined or identified.

**Request for Admission No. 9**

Admit that there is no due warning about PATHOLOGICAL ABUSE in Livestream Set Up windows.

**Objections to Request for Admission No. 9:**

YouTube objects to RFA No. 9 as premature, as the parties have not conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.” Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further

objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion. YouTube further objects to this request because “PATHOLOGICAL ABUSE,” “due warning,” and “Livestream Set Up windows” are not adequately defined or identified. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for information beyond YouTube’s knowledge, custody, or control.

**Request for Admission No. 10**

Admit or deny that PATHOLOGICAL ABUSE and HARASSMENT is a significant problem across the Youtube platform.

**Objections to Request for Admission No. 10:**

YouTube objects to RFA No. 10 as premature, as the parties have not conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.” Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater

1 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
2 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
3 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
4 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
5 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
6 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
7 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
8 a legal conclusion. YouTube further objects to this request because  
9 “PATHOLOGICAL ABUSE” and “HARASSMENT” are not adequately defined  
10 or identified. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
11 information beyond YouTube’s knowledge, custody, or control.

12 **Request for Admission No. 11**

13 Admit that tools available to Livestreamers are not adequate tools to prevent,  
14 address or enforce harassment policies of your platform.

15 **Objections to Request for Admission No. 11:**

16 YouTube objects to RFA No. 11 as premature, as the parties have not  
17 conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.”  
18 Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in  
19 violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until  
20 “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further  
21 objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California  
22 civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent  
23 with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater  
24 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
25 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
26 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
27 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
28

1 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
2 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
3 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
4 a legal conclusion. YouTube further objects to this request because  
5 “Livestreamers” is not adequately defined or identified. YouTube further objects  
6 to this request to the extent it calls for information beyond YouTube’s knowledge,  
7 custody, or control.

8 **Request for Admission No. 12**

9 Admit or deny that Thompson's content violates Youtube's Terms of  
10 Service.

11 **Objections to Request for Admission No. 12:**

12 YouTube objects to RFA No. 12 as premature, as the parties have not  
13 conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.”  
14 Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in  
15 violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until  
16 “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further  
17 objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California  
18 civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent  
19 with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater  
20 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
21 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
22 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
23 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
24 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
25 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
26 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
27 a legal conclusion.

1 **Request for Admission No. 13**

2 Admit that "Channel Reports" as opposed to specific video "reports" are not  
3 logged in the "Report Log" section of Youtube's interface.

4 **Objections to Request for Admission No. 13:**

5 YouTube objects to RFA No. 13 as premature, as the parties have not  
6 conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff "may not seek discovery."  
7 Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in  
8 violation of the Court's Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until  
9 "after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved." ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further  
10 objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California  
11 civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent  
12 with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater  
13 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
14 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
15 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
16 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
17 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
18 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
19 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
20 a legal conclusion. YouTube further objects to this request because "Channel  
21 Reports," "video 'reports'", "Report Log" and "interface" are not adequately  
22 defined or identified.

23 **Request for Admission No. 14**

24 Admit that you are incapable of upholding your Terms of Service as it  
25 concerns and/ or relates to all content being uploaded on Youtube.  
26  
27  
28

**Objections to Request for Admission No. 14:**

YouTube objects to RFA No. 14 as premature, as the parties have not conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.” Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.

**Request for Admission No. 15**

Admit that HL Channel remains published on your platform with your explicit knowledge and consent.

**Objections to Request for Admission No. 15:**

YouTube objects to RFA No. 15 as premature, as the parties have not conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.” Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California

1 civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent  
2 with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater  
3 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
4 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
5 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
6 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
7 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
8 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
9 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
10 a legal conclusion.

11 **Request for Admission No. 16**

12 Admit that you are aware that Thompson harasses and maliciously insults, as  
13 well as cyberstalks various individuals on your site to this day.

14 **Objections to Request for Admission No. 16:**

15 YouTube objects to RFA No. 16 as premature, as the parties have not  
16 conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.”  
17 Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in  
18 violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until  
19 “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further  
20 objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California  
21 civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent  
22 with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater  
23 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
24 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
25 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
26 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
27 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
28



1 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
2 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
3 a legal conclusion. YouTube further objects to this request because “harasses,”  
4 “insults,” “cyberstalks” and “various individuals” are not adequately defined or  
5 identified. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
6 information beyond YouTube’s knowledge, custody, or control.

7 **Request for Admission No. 17**

8 Admit that you believe HL Channel does not violate your  
9 Terms of Service.

10 **Objections to Request for Admission No. 17:**

11 YouTube objects to RFA No. 17 as premature, as the parties have not  
12 conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.”  
13 Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in  
14 violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until  
15 “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further  
16 objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California  
17 civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent  
18 with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater  
19 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
20 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
21 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
22 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
23 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
24 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
25 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
26 a legal conclusion.

1 **Request for Admission No. 18**

2 Admit that a warning could easily be made available about  
3 PATHOLOGICAL ABUSE and HARASSMENT on your platform.

4 **Objections to Request for Admission No. 18:**

5 YouTube objects to RFA No. 18 as premature, as the parties have not  
6 conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.”  
7 Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in  
8 violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until  
9 “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further  
10 objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California  
11 civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent  
12 with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater  
13 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
14 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
15 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
16 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
17 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
18 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
19 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
20 a legal conclusion. YouTube further objects to this request because  
21 “PATHOLOGICAL ABUSE” and “HARASSMENT” are not adequately defined  
22 or identified.

23 **Request for Admission No. 19**

24 Admit that users that have been banned, or otherwise prohibited from  
25 accessing their Youtube accounts can and often circumvent any such ban by simply  
26 creating a new Username or Channel on your platform whether or not this  
27 necessitates a VPN.

28

**Objections to Request for Admission No. 19:**

YouTube objects to RFA No. 19 as premature, as the parties have not conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.” Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion. YouTube further objects to this request because “ban,” “new Username,” and “new ... Channel” are not adequately defined or identified.

**Request for Admission No. 20**

Admit that machine learning or Artificial Intelligence (onward "Bots") are trained and instructed to represent specific groups over others.

**Objections to Request for Admission No. 20:**

YouTube objects to RFA No. 20 as premature, as the parties have not conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.” Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further

1 objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California  
2 civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent  
3 with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater  
4 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
5 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
6 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
7 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
8 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
9 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
10 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
11 a legal conclusion. YouTube further objects to this request because “Artificial  
12 Intelligence,” “Bots,” and “represent specific groups over others” are not  
13 adequately defined or identified.

14 **Request for Admission No. 21**

15 Admit that you do not believe HL Channel constitutes harassment of  
16 Plaintiff.

17 **Objections to Request for Admission No. 21:**

18 YouTube objects to RFA No. 21 as premature, as the parties have not  
19 conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.”  
20 Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in  
21 violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until  
22 “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further  
23 objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California  
24 civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent  
25 with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater  
26 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
27 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
28

1 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
2 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
3 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
4 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
5 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
6 a legal conclusion. YouTube further objects to this request because “harassment”  
7 is vague and ambiguous.

8 **Request for Admission No. 22**

9 Admit that Youtube avoids enforcing reports of harassment regularly

10 **Objections to Request for Admission No. 22:**

11 YouTube objects to RFA No. 22 as premature, as the parties have not  
12 conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.”  
13 Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in  
14 violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until  
15 “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further  
16 objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California  
17 civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent  
18 with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater  
19 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
20 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
21 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
22 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
23 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
24 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
25 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
26 a legal conclusion. YouTube further objects to this request because “harassment”  
27 and “regularly” are vague and ambiguous.

1 **Request for Admission No. 23**

2 Admit that Plaintiff is not responsible for the conduct of Thompson on your  
3 platform.

4 **Objections to Request for Admission No. 23:**

5 YouTube objects to RFA No. 23 as premature, as the parties have not  
6 conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.”  
7 Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in  
8 violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until  
9 “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further  
10 objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California  
11 civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent  
12 with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater  
13 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
14 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
15 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
16 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
17 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
18 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
19 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
20 a legal conclusion.

21 **Request for Admission No. 24**

22 Admit that there were no possible options for Plaintiff to have the  
23 aforementioned harassing conduct be addressed, and stopped once it began.

24 **Objections to Request for Admission No. 24:**

25 YouTube objects to RFA No. 24 as premature, as the parties have not  
26 conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.”  
27 Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in  
28

1 violation of the Court's Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until  
2 "after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved." ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further  
3 objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California  
4 civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent  
5 with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater  
6 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
7 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
8 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
9 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
10 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
11 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
12 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
13 a legal conclusion.

14 **Request for Admission No. 25**

15 Admit that significant harm was sustained by Plaintiff as a result of using of  
16 Youtube.

17 **Objections to Request for Admission No. 25:**

18 YouTube objects to RFA No. 25 as premature, as the parties have not  
19 conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff "may not seek discovery."  
20 Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in  
21 violation of the Court's Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until  
22 "after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved." ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further  
23 objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California  
24 civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent  
25 with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater  
26 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
27 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
28



1 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
2 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
3 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
4 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
5 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
6 a legal conclusion.

7 **Request for Admission No. 26**

8 Admit that Thompson's "Parking Lot Creeper" constitutes harassment of Mr.  
9 Justin Ray.

10 **Objections to Request for Admission No. 26:**

11 YouTube objects to RFA No. 26 as premature, as the parties have not  
12 conducted their Rule 26(f) conference and thus Plaintiff “may not seek discovery.”  
13 Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(d)(1). YouTube further objects to this request as served in  
14 violation of the Court’s Order, under which Discovery cannot commence until  
15 “after any Motions to Dismiss are resolved.” ECF 44 at 2. YouTube further  
16 objects to this request as propounded pursuant to an inapplicable rule of California  
17 civil procedure. YouTube objects to this request to the extent it is inconsistent  
18 with, or does not meet the requirements of, or seeks to impose obligations greater  
19 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. YouTube further  
20 objects to this request to the extent it calls for attorney client privileged, attorney  
21 work product, and/or any other applicable privilege or protected category of  
22 information, if any. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls  
23 for disclosure of confidential, proprietary, trade secret or other such like  
24 information, if any, prior to entry of a protective order in this matter governing  
25 such information. YouTube further objects to this request to the extent it calls for  
26 a legal conclusion. YouTube further objects to this request because “Parking Lot  
27  
28

1 Creeper” and “Mr. Justin Ray” are not adequately defined or identified. YouTube  
2 further objects to this request because “harassment” is vague and ambiguous.

3  
4 Dated: August 14, 2023

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
Professional Corporation

5  
6 By: /s/ Conor Tucker  
Conor Tucker

7  
8 *Attorney for Defendant*  
9 YOUTUBE LLC  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I am employed in Los Angeles County, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action. My business address is Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, PC, 1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 2800, Los Angeles, California 90071. My electronic mail (email) address is: [ctucker@wsgr.com](mailto:ctucker@wsgr.com).

On this date, the following document was served on the interested party below, using the following means:

YOUTUBE'S OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS, SET ONE

☒ By forwarding the document via email and by Federal Express as indicated below:

Todd Michael Schultz  
818 N. Doheny Dr., #1108  
West Hollywood, CA 90069  
[Toddschultz86@gmail.com](mailto:Toddschultz86@gmail.com)

Executed at Los Angeles, California on August 14, 2023.

Dated: August 14, 2023

*/s/ Conor Tucker*

---

Conor Tucker